



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/993,843	11/05/2001	Klas Nordstrom	031941-096	8003
27045	7590	07/14/2005	EXAMINER	
ERICSSON INC. 6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVR C11 PLANO, TX 75024			VEILLARD, JACQUES	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2165	

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/993,843	11/05/2001	Klas Nordstrom	031941-096	8003

7590

04/30/2004

Ronald L. Grudziecki
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

VEILLARD, JACQUES

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2175

DATE MAILED: 04/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

3

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/993,843

Applicant(s)

NORDSTROM ET AL.

Examiner

Jacques Veillard

Art Unit

2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 27-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 27-33, 35-44 and 46-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 34 and 45 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2175

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the Applicant's communication filed on 11/5.2001.
2. Claims 1-26 have been canceled, and claims 27-52 have been added as new claims.
3. Claims 27-52 are pending and presented for examination.
4. Claims 27 and 38 are the independent claims. Other claims are the dependent.

Priority

5. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in parent Application No. 9901588-5 (SWEDEN), filed on 5/4/1999. ***Information Disclosure Statement***

6. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 2/25/2002 was filed after the mailing date of the application on 11/5/2001. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2175

8. Claims 27-33, 35-44, 46-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergholm et al.(U. S. Pat. No. 5,761,432, hereinafter Bergholm) in view of Blau et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 5,696,697, hereinafter Blau).

As per claim 27, Bergholm teaches an attribute design database system provides for inventory management operates in a telecommunications management network environment (See the Title and the abstract). Similarly, the Bergholm's system comprising a service and resource database arrangement containing information regarding network resources (See the Abstract, and col.1, lines 55-67); and each resource being defined by data comprising: a point identifier that has characteristics associated with it, representing an abstract description of the resources capabilities; an abstraction of a common network element represented by a group of points that are considered to belong together; and a connection being defined by two connected points (see col.3, line 46 through col.4, line 37, and col.10, line 13 through col.11, 36). Bergholm does not explicitly teach wherein the database arrangement is structured so that each resource in the network has a time of existence as well as a place in a hierarchy of parent/child relations.

However, Blau, in the same endeavor, teaches a network element in a telecommunication network providing a number of different types of services (See the Title and abstract) includes the features wherein the database arrangement is structured so that each resource in the network has a time of existence as well as a place in a hierarchy of parent/child relations (See col.2, lines 17-30, col.3, lines 56-67, and col.7, lines 39-53).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention was made to modify the teachings of Bergholm with the teachings of Blau to include a hierarchical tree structure in order to organize the management information in form a

Art Unit: 2175

trees contains children and parents relationships (See Fig.9, col.4, lines 41-42, and col.7, lines 31-45).

As per claim 38, the claim has substantially the same limitations as claim 27. These limitations have already been addressed in the rejection of claim 27. Therefore, it is rejected on similar grounds corresponding to the arguments given for the rejected claim 27 above.

As per claims 28 and 39, the combination of Bergholm and Blau, as modified, teaches the claimed invention, wherein the point identifier also has characteristics associated with it in the form of a list of label/value pairs (See Bergholm's col.4, lines 9-12, and col.8, lines 50-56).

As per claims 29 and 40, the combination of Bergholm and Blau, as modified, teaches the claimed invention, wherein the common network element acts as a container for points, with an implicit characteristic that points on elements may cross-connect (See Blau's col.9, lines 18-23).

As per claims 30, 31, and 32, Blau teaches a telecommunication network providing a great number of different types of service. These services are often described with respect to a logical model of the network, wherein each logical network can represent an application specific view of the physical network and its network elements such as topological view, time view and hierarchical view (See Blau's Fig.11 and col.8, line 48 through col.9, line 16).

Art Unit: 2175

As per claims 41, 42, and 43, the claims have substantially the same limitations as claims 30, 31, and 32. These limitations have already been addressed in the rejection of claims 30, 31, and 32. Therefore, they are rejected on similar grounds corresponding to the arguments given for the rejected claims 30, 31, and 32 above.

As per claims 33 and 44, the combination of Bergholm and Blau, as modified, teaches the claimed invention, wherein the database arrangement is structured so as to model a characteristic view, which includes a list of characteristics of each resource (See Bergholm's figs.19 and 24, and col.12, line 65 through col.13, line 8).

As per claims 35 and 46, the combination of Bergholm and Blau, as modified, teaches the claimed invention, wherein the database arrangement structure is integrated in a data model for enabling control of each resource and the use of it in service instances (See Blau's col.9, lines 49-59).

As per claims 36 and 47, the combination of Bergholm and Blau, as modified, teaches the claimed invention, wherein the database arrangement is separated into a first database comprising resource types and resource instances and a second database comprising service types and service instances (See Blau's col.9, lines 24-39).

As per claims 37 and 48, the combination of Bergholm and Blau, as modified, teaches the claimed invention, wherein resource and/or service attributes is typed to distinguish between attribute types (See Blau's col.6, lines 53-64).

As per claim 49, the combination of Bergholm and Blau, as modified, teaches the claimed invention, wherein the resource handler is a service type handler in an operational support structure for a telecommunications network, for creating and maintaining service type recipes and their relations (See Bergholm's col.3, lines 15-25, and lines 46 through col.4, line 8).

As per claim 50, the combination of Bergholm and Blau, as modified, teaches the claimed invention, wherein the service type recipes provide a framework for service types, operations on service types, parameters on service types, hierarchical relations between service types, hierarchical parameter relationship, and translation of service types and associated parameters values into resource requirements and service type requirements (See Blau's abstract lines 9-13, col.4, lines 1-14, and col.15, lines 20-47).

As per claim 51, the combination of Bergholm and Blau, as modified, teaches the claimed invention, wherein the resource handler supports selecting between different types of required services, different types of required resources and different service instances (See Bergholm's col.5, lines 29-55).

As per claim 52, the combination of Bergholm and Blau, as modified, teaches the claimed invention, wherein the selected resources requirements are transferred to a resource handler that does the actual resource allocation (See Bergholm's col.3, lines 30-45).

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 34 and 45 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art taken alone or in combination fail to teach or suggest a system or method wherein the database arrangement is structured so as to model a usage view, which includes what resources are combined to form a complete service instance and the time when that service instance exists as recited in dependent claims 34 and 45.

Other Prior art Made Of Record

11. Chang	U. S. Pat No. 5,737,736,
Gopal et al.	U. S. Pat. No. 4,748,658,
Chee et al.	U. S. Pat. No. 6,526,397,
Somers	U. S. Pat. No. 6,243,396,
Taghadoss	U. S. Pat. No. 6,052,722, and
Cutrell et al.	U. S. Pat. No. 6,141,777.

Art Unit: 2175

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

13. **Any response to this action should be mail to:**

Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 746-7239 (for formal communication intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 746-7240 (for informal of draft communications, please label

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand - delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2021 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor Lobby (Receptionist Telephone No. (703) 305-3900).

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacques Veillard whose telephone number is (703) 305-7094. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 9:30 AM to 4: 30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici, can be reached on (703) 305-3830. The fax phone number for this group is (703) 308-5403.

Application/Control Number: 09/993,843

Page 9

Art Unit: 2175

Charles Rones
CHARLES RONES
PRIMARY EXAMINER

JV

Jacques Veillard
Patent Examiner TC 2100